

From POP3-Server@goldeneye.water.ca.gov Tue Jan 21 13:59:56 1997  
Received: from zephyr.water.ca.gov (zephyr [136.200.84.6])  
by goldeneye.water.ca.gov (8.8.4/8.8.4) with ESMTTP  
id OAA20621; Fri, 17 Jan 1997 14:26:46 -0800 (PST)  
Received: from sonnet1.sonnet.com (root@news.sonnet.com [207.212.101.2])  
by zephyr.water.ca.gov (8.8.4/8.8.4) with SMTP  
id OAA03540; Fri, 17 Jan 1997 14:27:25 -0800 (PST)  
Received: from LOCALNAME (ppp10-stk.sonnet.com [207.212.103.30]) by sonnet1.sonnet.com  
(8.6.13/8.6.12) with SMTP id OAA30076; Fri, 17 Jan 1997 14:31:49 -0800  
Date: Fri, 17 Jan 1997 14:31:49 -0800  
Message-Id: <199701172231.OAA30076@sonnet1.sonnet.com>  
X-Sender: chadwick@207.212.101.2  
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.2  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
To: rickb@water.ca.gov, wendyh@water.ca.gov  
From: Pete/Lydia Chadwick <chadwick@207.212.101.2>  
Subject: Comments on EIR/EIS Outlines  
Cc: fwernett@delta.dfg.ca.gov, 103063.2257@compuserve.com,  
74407.3440@compuserve.com, 74427.465@compuserve.com,  
76544.551@compuserve.com, 75402.177@compuserve.com,  
larry\_puckett@mail.fws.gov  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Length: 4037  
Status: RO

Rick and Wendy:

Thanks for the opportunit for DFG to review the outlines.

We generally find the outlines logical and thorough. These seem likely to result in very long and complicated documents and urge you to continue looking for ways to simplify and shorten them as we proceed.

We would hope that you could profit from the work done for the PEIS for the CVPIA. Particularly for the environmental setting and affected environment elements that seems likely to offer real savings.

Please consider the following specific comments:

The distinction between the level of program in the Problem and Solution areas is important and has been causing alot of confusion. It is important to make this clear as the program is described in the EIR/EIS. One specific place where the outline really makes confusion likely is in the geographic area breakdown. The outline proposes the Bay-Delta as one region. Since part of the Bay-Delta is the problem area and part is part of the solution area, we think you probably shoud divide the Bay Delta into two geographic areas to reflect that.

Under the draft outline for the Environmental Impacts/Consequences Technical Report, section 5.1 describes a comparison of the No Action Alternative to Existing Conditions. That's the correct approach although it isn't clear to me what "direct and construction related impacts" there will be to analyze under the No Action Alternative. In section 5.2, however,

1/25  
W- LET'S DISCUSS  
R

Fix

Fix

there is an implication that the detailed description of direct and construction related impacts and indirect and operational impacts will only be discussed under the comparison to the No Action Alternative. That is not appropriate relative to CEQA since the detailed discussion should also take place when comparing the Preferred Program and each of the alternatives with Existing Conditions. The summary of impacts and mitigation strategies must also relate to that comparison.

The Level of Detail write up for ecosystem restoration also requires some modifications. For instance, in the second paragraph it states that the function of the Ecosystem Restoration component is to provide a "direction" rather than a "prescription". That is not accurate. Where we can we are preparing prescriptions even if they are ranges. Also we are concerned that there will be conflicts between the EIR staff and the Ecosystem Restoration Plan folks about what is too detailed.

Under the Presentation of Results section it should be more clear that detailed discussions will also take place comparing the Preferred Program and each of the alternatives with Existing Conditions and that the summary of impacts and mitigation strategies will also relate to that comparison. The GIS effort and aerial photographs needs to extend to the Existing Condition analysis not just the No Action.

Lastly, the discussion says that summaries of the technical reports will be incorporated in the EIR/EIS. You undoubtedly are going to do that, but it isn't clear from the outline of the EIR/EIS that that takes place. This probably isn't a real problem, but you might anticipate questions about it since it isn't obvious.

Pete

Order may not mean much, but the reader should encounter the "alternative development process" before the description of the preferred alternative or the others.

The main purpose of the EIR/EIS ought to be the comparison among alternatives. This actually ends up being the last thing that is done, after each alternative is compared to the no action alternative. It will be important to explain how the preferred alternative came to be selected. It is not clear from the outline where this discussion will be found.

It isn't clear to me that the San Joaquin River Region includes the Tulare and Kern areas. As long as they do that's fine.

The language used implies that the Technical Reports are not part of the Programmatic EIR/EIS. A more accurate view is that they are part of the Programmatic EIR/EIS and that summaries will be provided in the main document.

*AGNEZ*

*EIR component is providing prescription. We'll adjust for PEIS analysis.*

*AGNEZ*